

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/824,210	CLEEVELY, BRUCE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Niki M. Eloshway	3781	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Niki M. Eloshway. (3) _____.

(2) Richard Lazarus (Reg. No. 48,215). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Original claims 1-17 and proposed claims 18 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bourgeois (applied in rejection).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative suggested amending the claims to recite that the pads have a first surface extending parallel to the axis, and a second surface with a first portion configured to engage the outer punch and a second portion forming a transition between the first portion and the inner wall of the skirt. The examiner agreed that such an amendment would define the present invention over Bourgeois since an outer punch could not engage the first portion during molding of the liner. The original claims were also reviewed but are not allowable at this time..